

TRANSCRIPT PREPARED BY THE CLERK OF THE LEGISLATURE  
Transcriber's Office  
FLOOR DEBATE

May 1, 2001

LB 542

earlier today before lunch, I do believe in protecting all of those items from the ravages of the environment, particularly in Nebraska, and that you extend the life, you reduce the maintenance, and in general it is a good...good investment. However, however, there is a balance I think that is necessary in the type of investment that you make to protect what is generally pretty durable equipment. Construction equipment, which is what we're talking about housing, is in fact designed to be operated in extreme conditions. It's designed to work in all kinds of weather and it is of very rugged construction. Housing it when it's not being in use is not a bad idea, but not exactly necessary in all instances. One of the things that concerns me, and it concerned me two years ago and it concerns me today, that if we use a major portion of our facilities improvements money that we have set aside and deemed to be appropriate for equipment storage, if we have those over...over designed then we have left equipment outside in some areas of the state that we would ordinarily otherwise be able to house, given the same amount of money. The state of the art in equipment storage is such that today you can build a quite durable building that is designed only for dry storage, not for maintenance, not for any of the things that you might use a...what we would call a shop. I think they're even listed in the Program 901 as, in fact, shops, so that's a different type of building that is needed for that. They are used year-round for people to work in to do the necessary upkeep, repairs, maintenance and that sort of thing on state-owned equipment. I think that we need to take from this bill those, what are there, five buildings today and give the Department of Roads the opportunity to reassess their design standards for those types of buildings and take another look at this in...if it's...if it is still on the...on the horizon of affordable things that we take another look at it next session in a deficit appropriation. I'm not convinced that we need to continue down the path that we've been on for a number of years of either doing one of two things--either not housing construction equipment or building buildings that use up a tremendous amount of resources when compared to the value received from housing the equipment. I would encourage you today to adopt this amendment and we'll move on. I will guarantee you that we will revisit the issue, but we might revisit it in a way where a solution is reached that much